



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,445	02/25/2004	Yasushi Maeno	04110 /LH	5650	
1933 7590 04/04/2007 FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 Fifth Avenue 16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			NEGRON, WANDA M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2622		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		04/04/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/787,445	MAENO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	Wanda M. Negrón	2622			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 February 2004</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r election requirement. r.	d to by the Evaminer			
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/787,445

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the operating system" in lines 9-10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/787,445

Art Unit: 2622

5 Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai (JP Published Application 2001-268413), and further in view of Abgrall (US 6,401,202 B1).

6. Regarding **claim 1**, Sakai discloses a camera device (see figure 1) comprising an optical system (11a-c), a driving unit which drives the optical system (11d-f), and a control unit (13, 21) which makes the driving unit start driving of the optical system to a predetermined state, i.e. releasing the collapsible zoom lens (see paragraph [0022]) by activating zoom motor 11d. Sakai, however, does not explicitly teach driving the optical system to a predetermined state by an initialization of the optical system using an interrupt processing which is executed by setting an interrupt processing routine before the operating system is started.

Abgrall, on the other hand, discloses a computer system with a BIOS program enabled for multitasking by using interrupt signals at predetermined interrupt times (see Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the multitasking operation of the BIOS, as taught by Abgrall, to initialize the optical system of Sakai to a known state before loading the operating system in order to decrease the amount of time required to initialize the camera for recording (see Sakai, paragraphs [0017] and [0021]) while still performing other time-consuming system initializations and memory tests.

Application/Control Number: 10/787,445

Art Unit: 2622

While it may not be explicitly stated in the references above that the functionality of an electronic device such as a computer system may be realized by a digital camera, it is well known to a skilled artisan that a digital camera and a computer system are in the same field of endeavor as they are both microcontroller/microprocessor controlled devices for processing data, such as imaging, image processing, and/or image manipulation.

Even if a digital camera and a computer system are not in the same field of endeavor, which the examiner does not concede, a digital camera and a computer system are reasonably pertinent to solving the problem of controlling the initialization of an optical system before performing other initialization routines, and would have commended themselves to an artisan addressing such a problem. In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 658, 23 USPQ2d 1058, 1060 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

- 7. Regarding **claims 2 and 3**, Sakai, as modified by Abgrall, discloses that said optical system comprises a sinkable lens, i.e. a collapsible lens (see paragraph [0003]), which is inherently a movable lens.
- 8. Method **claims 4, 5 and 6** are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 1, 2 and 3. Therefore method claims 4, 5 and 6 correspond to apparatus claims 1, 2 and 3 and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.
- 9. **Claims 7, 8 and 9** are drawn to a computer program stored in a computer readable medium corresponding to the method claimed in claims 4, 5 and 6.

Art Unit: 2622

Therefore claims 7, 8 and 9 correspond to method claims 4, 5 and 6 and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wanda M. Negrón whose telephone number is (571) 270-1129. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 am 4:00 pm alternate Fri off.
- 11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wanda M. Negrón March 29, 2007

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER